## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN

THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG & SARAH L. ACTION NO. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH BUNGE,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs,

v.

DAYBREAK, INC. dba HUBER & ASSOCIATES,

Defendant.

PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL
DEPOSITION OF CHIRS BUNGE AND IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EXTEND
FACT DISCOVERY CUT OFF

Plaintiffs, Thomas F. Friedberg and Sarah L. Bunge, hereby file the following Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Compel the Deposition of Chris Bunge and in Opposition to Motion to Extend the Fact Discovery Cut Off (Doc. 56). The basis of this opposition is that 1) neither non-party Chris Bunge nor Plaintiffs are available on April 24, 2025, but are available on April 26, 2025; and 2) that there is no good cause to modify the Scheduling Order.

I.

## INTRODUCTION/FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This is a single cause of action claim for a garden variety breach of contract arising from Defendant's failure to install cleats to secure the metal roof in breach of a specific contract term. The breach was discovered after Hurricane Irma when a portion of the metal roof was affected by wind damage which loosened and exposed the absence of cleats in the area where the roof panels loosened. (See Doc. 1). Plaintiffs' complaint was filed on July 14, 2019.

F&B v. Daybreak

USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline

April 19, 2025

Page 2

On October 7, 2019, Defendant file a Motion to Dismiss or Stay this action due to pending

litigation in the Superior Court with the same parties. (Doc. 12). On September 24, 2025, the

parties filed a joint status report advising the Court that the Superior Court case resolved. (Doc.30).

On September 25, 2024, the Court issued an Order that the Motion to Dismiss/Stay was moot.

(Doc. 31).

The Court held a Rule 16 Trial Management Conference on November 14, 2024, and

entered a Scheduling Order the same date. (Doc. 42). The Court set the fact discovery cut off for

May 7, 2025.

Between November 14, 2024, and early March 2025 Defendant did not notice or request

any depositions. On March 17, 2025, Defendant was scheduled to take the deposition of Plaintiffs,

Thomas Friedberg and Sarah Bunge. Defendant completed the deposition of Thomas Friedberg,

but due to the length of the deposition was unable to start the deposition of Sarah Bunge. The

deposition of Sarah Bunge was rescheduled to May 2, 2025.

On April 16, 2025, for the first time Defendant requested the deposition of non-party Chris

Bunge, who worked for Plaintiffs at their St. John property through May 2024. Chris Bunge is

Sarah Bunge's brother. Chris Bunge now resides in Okabena, Minnesota. Chirs Bunge is not a

party to this lawsuit and, to date, has not been served with a subpoena for his deposition. Plaintiffs

had a pre-planned business trip to Minnesota for meetings and other business obligations relating

to the family farm business for which Sarah Bunge is the trustee. Plaintiffs are scheduled to fly to

Minnesota on April 21, 2025, and returning to California on April 26, 2025.

F&B v. Daybreak

USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline

April 19, 2025

Page 3

On April 16, 2025, when the defense counsel's office requested the deposition, I initially

stated that April 24, 2025 would work. I failed to check at that time with either Chris Bunge or

with Sarah Bunge regarding the meetings pertaining to the family farm which was the very reason

why we were flying to Minnesota. Within 1 to 2 hours of that conversation, I advised the defense

counsel that April 24, 2025 would not work due to pre-planned meetings regarding the family

farm. I then advised defense counsel that I would change our flight to April 27, 2025, and the

deposition could take place on April 26, 2025.

I also spoke to Chris Bunge who advised me that he had prior commitments between April

22 through 25, 2025, but would make himself available for deposition on April 26, 2025. This date

was offered to defense counsel who declined to accept insisting that the deposition go forward on

April 24, 2025.

The parties met and conferred on April 17, 2025. The offer to go forward with the

deposition on April 26, 2025, was again extended. Defense counsel has refused and insists that the

deposition of non-party Chris Bunge go forward on April 24, 2025. Defense counsel did not offer

a reason as to why April 26, 2025, would not work other than to state that he did not want to take

the deposition on this date.

The defense counsel has now filed a Motion to Compel seeking to compel non-party Chris

Bunge to attend his deposition on April 24, 2025, a date which is not available for either Chris

Bunge or Plaintiffs. The date of April 26, 2025, is still available if defense counsel wants to depose

F&B v. Daybreak

USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline

April 19, 2025

Page 4

Chris Bunge. Plaintiffs oppose the deposition of non-party Chris Bunge going forward on April

24, 2025, due to the unavailability of Chris Bunge and Plaintiffs.

The defense counsel is also requesting that the Court modify the Scheduling Order to

extend the fact discovery cut off for the deposition of Chris Bunge to July 1, 2025. This request is

objected to since there has been no showing of good cause to modify the Scheduling Order. First,

defense counsel waited over 4 months after the Scheduling Order was entered to even request the

deposition of non-party Chris Bunge. Second, the request for the deposition was made 3 weeks

prior to the close of fact discovery. Third, the defense counsel has been provided a confirmed date

for the deposition of April 26, 2025, which can either be taken in person or by zoom.

There has not been any showing of good cause why defense counsel did not seek to take

the deposition earlier to accommodate the fact discovery cut off or why defense counsel cannot

take the deposition on the April 26, 2025, date that non-party witness Chris Bunge is available.

Defense counsel instead seeks a Court Order compelling non-party Chris Bunge (who has not been

subpoenaed) to appear on April 24, 2025, a date that is not available for Chris Bunge or Plaintiffs.

II.

DEFENDANT'S HAVE FAILED TO ESTABLISH GOOD CAUSE FOR THE

RELIEF REQUESTED

Defendant's seek to 1) compel the deposition of non-party Chris Bunge for a date when he

is not available despite offering a date just 2 days later; and 2) Defendant's seek to Modify the

Scheduling Order to extend the fact discovery cut off due even though non-party Chris Bunge has

F&B v. Daybreak

USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline

April 19, 2025

Page 5

agreed to make himself available for deposition on April 26, 2025, within the fact discovery period.

These requests should be denied since defense counsel has failed to show good cause.

Under Fed.R.Civ.P. 16(b)(4) a schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the

judge's consent. Here, defense counsel fails to even mention in its motion that non-party Chris

Bunge is not available on April 24, 2025, but is available 2 days later on April 26, 2025. Defense

counsel has further failed to state anything in its motion why the deposition cannot be taken on

Apil 26, 2025. Defense counsel is hanging its hat on the fact that on April 16, 2025, the date of

April 24, 2025 was mistakenly agreed to by Plaintiffs' counsel but was corrected within 1 to 2

hours when Plaintiffs' counsel advised defense counsel that April 24, 2025, was not an available

date and April 26, 2025, was proposed. The date of April 26, 2025, is still available if defense

counsel wants to take the deposition of non-party Chris Bunge. Defense counsel's motion fails to

even address the April 26, 2025, date, let alone set forth any facts to establish good cause why the

deposition cannot go forward on April 26, 2025.

Defense counsel then also wants to extend the fact discovery cut off to July 1, 2025. This

request is opposed for the following reasons: 1) no good cause has been shown why the fact

discovery cut off should be extended; 2) the currently open fact discovery matters can be

completed prior to the deadline of May 7, 2025; 3) a modification of the fact discovery deadline

would affect the remaining items on the Scheduling Order, including the mediation now set before

David Nichols on June 3, 2025 – mediation commencement deadline is June 6, 2025, Rule 26

expert reports for Plaintiffs due July 15, 2025, Rule 26 expert reports for the defense due August

F&B v. Daybreak

USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline

April 19, 2025

Page 6

15, 2025; and 4) the remaining discovery consisting of 3 other depositions and the site inspection

will be completed prior to the deadline. The deposition of Barry Huber is set for April 28, 2025,

the deposition of Sarah Bunge scheduled for May 2, 2025, and the site inspection is scheduled for

May 6, 2025. The only other deposition to be taken is Micha Cady, one of Defendant's workers

which is tentatively set for May 2, 2025, prior to the deposition of Sarah Bunge, and can be

completed prior to May 7, 2025.

Defense counsel represented that he could complete the deposition of Chris Bunge in 1 ½

hours. As an accommodation, Plaintiffs counsel and Chris Bunge will agree to the April 24, 2025,

date if the deposition can start by 8:00 am and be completed no later than 10:00 am so that

Plaintiffs' counsel and Chris Bunge's previously scheduled meetings can still take place on April

24, 2025. If this hard stop time is not agreeable, then April 26, 2025, is the other option.

III.

**CONCLUSION** 

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that the Court deny Defendant's Motion to Compel the

deposition of non-party Chris Bunge and further deny the request to modify the Scheduling Order

to extend the fact discovery cut off.

Plaintiffs further request that in the event the Court sets a hearing, that the Court be aware

Plaintiffs are traveling from California to Minnesota on April 21, 2025, and not available for either

a remote or in person appearance. Plaintiffs also request that in the event the Court does schedule

F&B v. Daybreak USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline April 19, 2025 Page 7

a hearing on this matter, that Plaintiffs be allowed to appear remotely since they will be in Minnesota and unable to travel to St. Croix.

Dated: April 19, 2025 LAW OFFICES OF FRIEDBERG & BUNGE

By: /s/ THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG, ESQ.

THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG, ESQ.(VI#1006) Attorneys for Plaintiffs THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG & SARAH L. BUNGE THE LAW OFFICES OF FRIEDBERG & BUNGE

1005 ROSECRANS STREET, SUITE 202 PO BOX 6814 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92166

TEL: (619)557-0101 FAX: (619)557-0560

E-mail: "tom@lawofficefb.com"

F&B v. Daybreak USCD Case No. 3:19-cv-0053-RAM-EAH Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Compel/Extend Fact Discovery Deadline April 19, 2025 Page 8

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 19th day of April 2025, a true and correct copy of **PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION OF CHIRS BUNGE AND IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EXTEND FACT DISCOVERY CUT OFF** was filed the CM/ECF system which will provide notice to the following:

Jeffrey C. Cosby, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 967981
Service to: <a href="mailto:eservice@wlclaw.com">eservice@wlclaw.com</a>
Attorney for Defendant Daybreak Inc Williams, Leininger & Cosby, P.A. 301 SE Ocean Blvd., Suite 205
Stuart, FL 34994

Telephone: 772-463-8402 Facsimile: 772-463-4820

Andrew C. Simpson ANDREW C. SIMPSON, PC 2191 Church St., Ste. 5 Christiansted, VI 00820 TEL: 340.719.3900

E-MAIL:asimpson@coralbrief.com

/s/ THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG
THOMAS F. FRIEDBERG